

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 10, 13, 15-18, 20, 23-27, 29, 30 and 41-43 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 13, 15, 18 and 42 are amended and claim 12 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, independent claim 10 is amended to include features of dependent claim 12. The other amendments are merely for clarity and do not raise new issues. Entry is thus proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 10, 12-13, 15-18, 20 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by newly-cited U.S. Patent Publication 2006/0052090 to Behr et al. (hereafter Behr). The Office Action also rejects claims 23-27 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Behr in view of previously-cited U.S. Patent 6,681,109 to Leifer and U.S. Patent 6,865,261 to Rao et al. (hereafter Rao). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites transmitting the searched content to the mobile terminal, the transmitted content including conversation multimedia relevant to the particular business, the particular building or the particular public place of the current location of the mobile terminal. Independent claim 1 also recites determining the particular business, the particular building or the particular public place coinciding with the tracking location of the mobile terminal on the

electronic map as a site of the mobile terminal. Still further, independent claim 1 recites that transmitting the searched content to the mobile terminal includes transmitting a menu listing a plurality of situations corresponding to the determined particular business, the determined particular building or the determined particular public place, displaying the menu listing the plurality of situations on the mobile terminal, and transmitting, when a specific one of the situations is selected from the displayed menu on the mobile terminal, at least one conversation multimedia phrase to the mobile terminal, the at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations from the menu.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, Behr does not teach or suggest the features alleged in the Office Action. That is, the Office Action primarily relies on Behr's paragraphs [0041], [0043], [0064], [0070], and [0133]-[0144] for independent claim 1 features. However, Behr does not relate to determining a particular business, a particular building or a particular public place coinciding with a tracking location of the mobile terminal.

Behr's paragraphs [0064] and [0070] do not suggest determining a particular business, a particular building or a particular public place coinciding with a tracking location. Behr discloses locating a plurality of McDonald restaurants within a specified driving distance or driving time from a specified origin. See Behr's paragraphs [0064] and [0070]. This does not relate to determining the particular business, the particular building or particular public place coinciding with the tracking location of the mobile terminal.

Furthermore, Behr's paragraph [0070] relates to a query including a route query, a point of interest query, a language query or a metro area query. The point of interest query may include a list of points that satisfy specific criteria, such as a list of restaurants within a specified distance or specified time of a specified origin. This does not relate to determining a particular business, a particular building or a particular public place coinciding with a tracking location of a mobile terminal.

The Office Action also cites Behr's paragraphs [0070], [0133]-[0144] and Fig. 40 for features relating to transmitting the menu listing the plurality of situations, displaying the menu and transmitting at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations from the menu. However, these cited paragraphs do not relate to transmitting a menu listing a plurality of situations, displaying the menu and/or transmitting at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations. Behr does not suggest a menu listing a plurality of situations and/or conversation multimedia phrases.

FIG. 40 merely shows tokens of driving instructions in English, Spanish and German. Behr's paragraphs [0123]-[0131] also discuss the types of driving instructions. Further, paragraph [0060] also discusses the information within the map database 72. These sections do not relate to a menu listing a plurality of situations and/or conversation multimedia phrases.

Independent claim 1 also recites receiving an inherent number given to a base transceiver station controlling the mobile terminal and a tracking location of the mobile terminal, the tracking location being carried out on a continuous basis from a network. However, Behr does not suggest the tracking location being carried out on a continuous basis from a network. At

best, Behr merely discloses that a query sent from a remote unit to a base unit may include an origin point. See Behr's paragraph [0068]. This does not correspond to the claimed tracking location being carried out on a continuous basis.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Behr does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites transmitting the multimedia data to the mobile terminal, the transmitted multimedia data including English conversation multimedia phrases relating to a plurality of conversations at one of a business or a building corresponding to the registered final location of the tracked specific mobile terminal, wherein the English conversation multimedia phrases comprise phrases to be used at the one of the business or the building corresponding to the registered final location of the tracked specific mobile terminal. Independent claim 10 also recites determining the one of the business or the building coinciding with the tracking location of the mobile terminal on the electronic map as the site of the mobile terminal.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Behr does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. Furthermore, when addressing the features of previous dependent claim 12 that are now incorporated into independent claim 10, the Office Action references Behr's paragraphs [0070] and [0143]-[0144]. However, Behr does not suggest phrases to be used at one of the business or the building corresponding to the registered final location of the tracked specific mobile terminal. Behr's disclosure of driving instructions and/or information within the menu database 72 do not correspond to the claimed phrases to be used at one of the business or the building. Still further, for at least similar reasons as set forth above,

Behr does not teach or suggest that the tracking location being carried out on a continuous basis from a network. Accordingly, Behr does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 18 recites storing a plurality of English language conversational phrases as multimedia data corresponding to a plurality of situations of a plurality of specific locations. Independent claim 18 also recites transmitting English language conversation multimedia phrases to the mobile terminal, the English language conversation multimedia phrases corresponding to a plurality of conversations relevant to the specific location of the mobile terminal. Still further, independent claim 18 recites determining the specific location coinciding with the tracking location of the mobile terminal on the electronic map as the site of the mobile terminal. Still further, independent claim 18 recites that transmitting the English language conversation multimedia phrases to the mobile terminal comprises transmitting a menu listing the plurality of situations corresponding to the determined specific location, and transmitting, when a specific one of the situations is selected from the menu on the mobile terminal, the English language conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations from the menu.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Behr does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 18. Behr does not teach or suggest a plurality of English language conversational phrases. Additionally, for at least similar reasons as set forth above, Behr does not teach or suggest that a tracking location of a mobile terminal through carrying out on a continuous basis from a network. Thus, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 23 recites transmitting a selected one of the plurality of the restaurant related English conversation multimedia phrases to the mobile terminal when it is determined that the present location of the mobile terminal is a restaurant. Independent claim 23 also recites that the restaurant related English conversation multimedia phrases are classified into a first situation multimedia data for ordering meals, a second situation multimedia data for dining at the restaurant, and a third situation multimedia data for paying a bill at the restaurant, and wherein one of the first, second, and third situation multimedia data selected from the mobile terminal is transmitted to the mobile terminal.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 23. More specifically, the Office Action cites Behr's paragraphs [0041], [0043], [0064], [0070], [0080] and [0133]-[0144] for features relating to English conversation multimedia phrases being classified into the first situation multimedia data, the second situation multimedia data and the third situation multimedia data. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Behr does not teach or suggest these features of the first, second and third situation multimedia data. The other applied references do not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 23. Thus, independent claim 23 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 23 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 4 recites that the multimedia information content comprises at least one of a series of conversational phrases appropriate to the current location of the mobile terminal. The Office Action asserts that Behr's paragraphs [0070], [0133]-[0144] and Figure 40 teach these features. However, these cited sections do not relate to conversational phrases appropriate to the current location of the mobile terminal. Thus, dependent claim 4 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Additionally, dependent claim 16 recites that the multimedia data comprises packet data having video data representing virtual situations for each of a plurality of sites, audio data representing conversations pertaining to the virtual situations, and text data expressing a text transcription of conversation contents of the audio data. The Office Action cites Behr's paragraphs [0070], [0133]-[0144] and Figure 40 for these features. However, these cited sections do not relate to video data, audio data and text data. Accordingly, Behr does not teach or suggest all the features of dependent claim 16. Thus, dependent claim 16 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Still further, dependent claim 41 recites that determining comprises determining that the mobile terminal is located within a restaurant and that searching the database comprises searching for information corresponding to the restaurant the mobile terminal is located within. See also dependent claims 42 and 43. However, Behr does not suggest determining that the mobile terminal is located within a restaurant. Behr's disclosure of identifying restaurants based on a specified driving distance or driving time from a specified origin does not correspond to

Serial No. **10/040,759**
Reply to Office Action dated December 6, 2006

Docket No. **K-0369**

determining that the mobile terminal is located within a restaurant. Thus, dependent claims 41-43 define patentable subject matter at least for these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4, 10, 13, 15-18, 20, 23-27, 29, 30 and 41-43 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: March 6, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610